



*Building Missouri's future...
by degrees®*

Higher Education System Review Task Force Interim Report

Overview

The Higher Education System Review Task Force was established at the request of Todd Richardson, Speaker of the Missouri House of Representatives, and Stephen Cookson, Chairman of the House of Representatives' Higher Education Committee. The Coordinating Board appointed the System Review Task Force at its June 9, 2016, meeting.

In their charge to the task force, the board asked the group to:

1. Conduct a systematic and thorough review of the overall structure of Missouri's system of higher education, which will include but not be limited to institutional missions, admissions selectivity, academic program review and approval, and geographic service regions.
2. Conduct a review of the demand for and supply of postsecondary education including occupational, geographic, and student perspectives.
3. Assess the relevance and functionality of the Coordinating Board's current mission approval structure and recommend changes to or replacement of that model.
4. Recommend revisions to the Coordinating Board policies both as they relate to future mission reviews and for program approval.
5. Recommend statutory changes as needed to enable the implementation of the revised system of institutional missions and program approval processes.

In the first stage of its work, the task force focused on the supply of and demand for postsecondary programs and developed a framework that will allow institutions to offer programs outside their state-defined missions if needed to fill a gap between supply and demand. Implementation of this framework requires a thorough revision of the Coordinating Board's academic program review process. The following task force recommendations focus on these revisions. Following these recommendations, the report summarizes information provided by National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), the consultants engaged to inform the task force's work, relevant to that discussion. The report concludes with recommendations relevant to the same discussion and next steps needed to address the other items the board charged the task force with addressing.

This report was endorsed by the task force on December 13, 2016.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Updating the Academic Program Approval Process to Allow Institutions to Meet Workforce Needs

The Coordinating Board must strike a balance between encouraging institutions to maintain fidelity to their core missions and granting institutions the flexibility they need to meet workforce demands. Task force discussions focused on the role the academic program approval process should play in striking that balance. There was broad consensus among task force members that the current academic program approval process should be updated to streamline the process for review of academic programs that are

within an institution's state-defined mission and to give institutions a mechanism by which to propose programs that are outside their state-defined mission.

Based on that consensus, the task force and a subcommittee of chief academic officers developed a proposed new framework for academic program approval. The framework, which is included as an attachment to this report and appended as if fully set forth herein, includes three levels of review for action related to academic program changes and requests for approval submitted by public institutions:

- Staff review, which would apply to minor program changes.
- Routine review, which would apply to proposed programs that are within an institution's state-defined mission and service region, do not unnecessarily duplicate an existing program in the geographically applicable area or other relevant distinction, will be offered at the institution's main campus, will build on existing programs and faculty expertise, and can be launched with minimal expense and within an institution's current operating budget. Proposals that fit within these parameters would be approved on an expedited basis.
- Comprehensive review, which would apply to proposals that constitute more significant changes described in detail in the attached framework. Proposals that meet any one of the criteria in the framework would be subject to a comprehensive review through which they would be required to demonstrate that the offeror made a good-faith effort to explore the feasibility of offering the program in collaboration with an institution the mission of which includes offering the program, is contributing substantially to the goals in the Coordinating Board's *Blueprint for Higher Education*, and has the existing capacity to ensure the program is delivered in a high-quality manner. The institution would also have to demonstrate that the proposed program is needed and that it has a clear plan to meet the articulated workforce need.

Pathways to Expanded Degree Offerings at Public Institutions

1. **Research and first-professional degrees.** The University of Missouri System (UM) and its four campuses (University of Missouri-Columbia, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Missouri University of Science and Technology, and University of Missouri-St. Louis) must strengthen its status as the state's public research university and exclusive granter of research doctorates. No other public college or university may offer a PhD or a first-professional degree, including chiropractic, dentistry, law, medicine, optometry, osteopathic medicine, pharmacy, podiatry, theology, and veterinary medicine. In order to meet an identified regional or local workforce need, collaborative programs in these fields with other Missouri institutions will continue to be an option.
2. **Exceptions to mission.**
 - a. **General principles.**
 - i. Collaboration is strongly preferred as the means by which an institution should meet a local or regional workforce need for a program outside the institution's state-defined mission.
 - ii. The Coordinating Board should approve an institution's request to offer a program outside its state-defined mission only after a comprehensive review.
 - iii. Approval of the program will be granted as an exception to the institution's state-defined mission and not as a change in mission. It will not represent a general authorization to grant degrees outside the institution's state-defined mission.

b. **Specific applications.**

- i. **Practice doctorates.** Missouri should continue the policy of focusing professional doctoral program capacity at a limited number of universities. The Coordinating Board should emphasize collaboration as the means to ensure access to these programs in all regions.

Harris-Stowe State University, Lincoln University, Missouri Southern State University, Missouri State University, Missouri Western State University, Northwest Missouri State University, Southeast Missouri State University, Truman State University, and the University of Central Missouri should be authorized to offer practice doctorates independently only when doing so would not unnecessarily duplicate an existing program, collaboration is not feasible or a viable means of meeting the needs of students and employers, and the institution has the academic and financial capacity to offer the program in a high-quality manner.

- ii. **Engineering.** Missouri should continue the policy of focusing capacity in undergraduate engineering programs (CIP Code 14) at a limited number of institutions and should emphasize collaboration as the means to ensure access to these programs in all regions.

Harris-Stowe State University, Lincoln University, Missouri Southern State University, Missouri State University, Missouri Western State University, Northwest Missouri State University, Southeast Missouri State University, Truman State University, and the University of Central Missouri may offer an engineering program only in collaboration with UM, provided that such collaborative agreements are approved by the governing board of each institution and that in these instances a UM campus will be the degree-granting institution. Should UM decline to collaborate in the offering of such programs, one of these institutions may seek approval of the program through the Coordinating Board's comprehensive review process when doing so would not unnecessarily duplicate an existing program, collaboration is not feasible or a viable means of meeting the needs of students and employers, and the institution has the academic and financial capacity to offer the program in a high-quality manner.

- iii. **Bachelor's degrees.** Missouri should continue the policy of limiting the degree-granting authority of public two-year institutions to the associate degree and certificate levels. The Coordinating Board should emphasize collaboration as the means to ensure access to these programs in all regions.

Public two-year institutions should be authorized to offer bachelor's degrees only if the level of education required in a field for accreditation or licensure increases to that level or, in the case of applied bachelor's degrees, the level of education required for employment in a field increases to that level, and when doing so would not unnecessarily duplicate an existing program, collaboration with a university is not feasible or the approach is not a viable means of meeting the needs of students and employers, and the institution has the academic and financial capacity to offer the program in a high-quality manner. Quality for such bachelor's degrees shall be evaluated at least in part by the delivery of upper-level coursework or competencies, and defined by accreditation or compliance with the Higher Learning Commission standards for bachelor's degrees.

3. Operational recommendations.

- a. ***Proposal cycle.*** Proposals will be submitted to the Coordinating Board by July 1 of each year. The Coordinating Board will determine which proposals to move forward with and announce their decision in September. Final decisions will ordinarily be made by February.
 - b. ***Phased implementation.***
 - i. ***Year 1.*** The Coordinating Board will consider no more than three proposals, in total, to offer a degree outside an institution's state-defined mission during the first year the new framework is operational. No more than two proposals may come from either public universities or public two-year institutions. In the case of a changed licensure requirement that might warrant the authorization of more than one public two-year institution to offer a bachelor's degree, that proposal may be considered one proposal.
 - ii. ***Year 2.*** The Coordinating Board will consider no more than five proposals, in total, to offer a degree outside an institution's state-defined mission during the second year the new framework is operational. No more than three proposals may come from either public universities or public two-year institutions. In the case of a changed licensure requirement that might warrant the authorization of more than one public two-year institution to offer a bachelor's degree, that proposal may be considered one proposal.
 - iii. ***Year 3.*** The Coordinating Board will reconvene a task force to evaluate the new framework after two proposal cycles and recommend changes.
4. **Items for additional discussion.** Much of the task force's discussion to date has focused on institutions' ability to propose programs outside of their state-defined mission and the development of a framework by which those proposals could be evaluated. Several topics warrant significant additional conversation, including:
 - a. ***Continued work on the new academic program approval framework.*** The framework developed by the task force and its subcommittee of chief academic officers requires significant additional discussion to develop and operationalize its details. The task force will appoint a subcommittee comprised of the Chief Academic Officers Council to work on this issue.
 - b. ***Meeting students' needs and increasing postsecondary educational attainment rates.*** NCHEMS' data suggest that the greatest gains in attainment can be made by focusing on increasing the college-going rate for 20- to 39-year olds and increasing completion rates at two-year institutions.¹ The data also indicate disparate access to and success in postsecondary programs among students in different geographic regions and of different races.² The task force will appoint a subcommittee to work on this issue.
 - c. ***Strengthening collaboration.*** Missouri's colleges and universities have a strong history of collaboration and have worked together in innovative ways to deliver high-quality programs throughout the state. The task force will appoint a subcommittee to develop principles of best practice in the collaborative delivery of programs and recommendations for policy changes that will provide more effective incentives for collaboration.

¹ NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slide 29.

² NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slides 10 and 63-65.

- d. ***Evaluating the mission review process.*** The task force will appoint a subcommittee to evaluate the mission review and approval process and make recommendations about revisions to Coordinating Board policies that pertain to mission review and approval.

Addressing regional institutional roles. NCHEMS recommends that the Coordinating Board take a proactive leadership role in facilitating coordination and collaboration among institutions serving the same geographic area, especially the Kansas City and St. Louis metropolitan areas. The task force encourages the Coordinating Board to appoint a work group to address this issue and report back to the board.

SUMMARY OF NCHEMS' OBSERVATIONS

Establishing a Baseline: Mission Review

The Coordinating Board charged the task force with reviewing the overall structure of Missouri's system of higher education, including each public institution's state-defined mission. Department staff engaged NCHEMS to develop an inventory of state-defined missions that will answer the following questions:

- Who does the institution serve? What kind of students, in terms of geographic area, level of academic preparation, and at what level of study? What kind of employers and economic development interests does the institution meet the needs of? What communities does the institution serve?
- What services does the institution offer? What levels of instruction are offered and what research is conducted?
- Does the institution have any special features or designations, such as status as a land-grant institution, a historically black college or university (HBCU), a liberal arts institution, or an institution with a special mission such as public affairs, applied learning, or international?³

NCHEMS has examined each institution's mission as indicated by state law, CBHE policy, and institutional documents, and has also developed statements of "behavioral" mission as reflected by audiences actually served, programs and services offered, and special competencies or unique capabilities. NCHEMS also compared each institution's "on paper" and "behavioral" missions. Based on that information, they developed a draft inventory of state-defined missions that includes some recommendations about changes in individual institutions' state-defined missions. Those recommendations were distributed to institutions on November 22, 2016, with a request for feedback by January 6, 2017. Department staff plan to present the state-defined mission inventory to the Coordinating Board for their consideration at the February 2, 2017, board meeting.

When the state-defined missions are approved by the Coordinating Board, they will be a device for articulating each institution's contribution to system capacity and ensuring differentiated contributions to the state's higher education goals.⁴ In addition, an inventory of state-defined missions will allow the Coordinating Board to identify gaps in terms of populations and geographic areas served and program offerings needed.

Identifying the Gaps: Supply and Demand

The Coordinating Board also asked the task force to review the demand for and supply of postsecondary education, including occupational, geographic, and student perspectives. The student perspective will be

³ NCHEMS Role and Mission for Missouri Colleges and Universities, slides 3-4.

⁴ NCHEMS Role and Mission for Missouri Colleges and Universities, slide 2.

explored in future work, but the task force did receive information about the occupational and geographic perspective.

Occupational Perspective

NCHEMS' research strongly suggests that Missouri's higher education system must evolve in order to compete on a national and global level. Forty-two percent of young adults in Missouri have an associate degree or higher, which is slightly lower than the national average of 45.7 percent and significantly lower than the national averages of Korea, Canada, Luxembourg, Ireland, the United Kingdom, Norway, Australia, Israel, Switzerland, and Sweden. Older Missourians have even lower rates of educational attainment. Only 41.7 percent of Missouri adults 35-44 years old have associate degrees or higher. That percent drops to 34.8 for adults 45-54 and 34.4 for adults 55-64.⁵

When these rates of educational attainment are compared to the percent of jobs that will require a postsecondary education in the future, it is clear that there is a gap. In 2020, 66 percent of jobs in Missouri will require a postsecondary education.⁶ Many of these jobs, however, will require a postsecondary credential that is often not taken into account when calculating states' educational attainment levels: a certificate or credential that takes less than two years to complete. Jobs for which certificates are required are projected to grow more than any other jobs requiring postsecondary credentials by 2020. NCHEMS' data indicate that there will be 255,000 new jobs that require a certificate between 2010 and 2020, compared to 84,000 jobs that require associate degrees; 219,000 that require baccalaureate degrees; and 117,000 that require graduate or professional degrees.⁷

NCHEMS also examined supply and demand within several industry clusters. At the baccalaureate and higher levels, NCHEMS concluded that Missouri is producing more graduates with degrees in healthcare (not including nursing); human services; research, planning, and analysis; communications; life and physical sciences; design; and agriculture than are needed in the workforce. The industry clusters for which there is an undersupply of baccalaureate-prepared graduates include finance; nursing; clerical and administrative; computing/IT; engineering; construction and architecture; transportation; hospitality, food, and tourism; and manufacturing and production.⁸

At the associate and certificate level, NCHEMS concluded that Missouri is producing more sub-baccalaureate level graduates in nursing, computing/IT, and engineering than are needed in the workforce. The industry clusters for which there is an undersupply of associate and certificate level graduates include clerical and administrative; maintenance, repair, and installation; healthcare (clerical and support); finance; healthcare (not including nursing); manufacturing and production; human services; and agriculture.⁹

It is important to note, however, that some of the data presented above are inconsistent with other sources of labor market information, especially when broken down by region. St. Louis Community College, for example, has provided data produced by the Missouri Economic Research & Information Center and Burning Glass Technologies that indicate that, in the St. Louis metropolitan area, there are significantly more openings for associate degree nurses than local postsecondary institutions are producing. STLCC and other institutions have also noted that conversations with local employers contradict NCHEMS' conclusions, especially in the areas of nursing and computing/information technology.

All of the above notwithstanding, NCHEMS also observed that data about current and projected demand are insufficient to make the case to support the addition of programs. They recommend a different

⁵ NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slide 6.

⁶ NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slide 14.

⁷ NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slide 20.

⁸ NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slide 21.

⁹ NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slide 22.

approach to determining demand, such as initiating a program on a collaborative basis to test its sustainability.¹⁰

Geographic Perspective

NCHEMS' data and observations suggest two primary challenges in terms of geography: Students in some rural areas of the state participate in postsecondary education at significantly lower rates than their peers in other areas, while public institutions in urban areas may plan to offer programs that duplicate programs already offered by other public institutions in the area.

Proximity to a college or university impacts college-going rates dramatically. Most public universities in Missouri draw their enrollment from their immediate region – and from St. Louis and Kansas City.¹¹ As a result, some regions of the state are underserved in terms of access to public postsecondary education. High school seniors from 15 Missouri counties are significantly less likely than their peers from other counties to start a postsecondary program at a public institution immediately after graduation.¹²

Counties from Which the Lowest Percent of High School Graduates Enroll in Public Postsecondary Education

<u>Any Public Institution</u>	<u>Public Two-Year Institutions</u>	<u>Public Universities</u>
Barry	Andrew	Butler
Barton	Atchison	Carter
Cedar	Barry	Clark
Clark	Barton	Douglas
Douglas	Buchanan	Howell
Hickory	Gentry	Marion
Lewis	Holt	Oregon
Linn	Lewis	Ozark
Macon	Madison	Ripley
Madison	Mercer	Shannon
Mercer	Nodaway	Texas
Ozark	Putnam	Washington
Putnam	Vernon	Wayne
Vernon	Worth	Wright
Worth		

NCHEMS noted that historically, students have been expected to go to the provider. Now students must be served where they are with the content taken to them.¹³

For high school graduates in St. Louis and Kansas City, on the other hand, NCHEMS observed that nearly every public university in the state draws students from those areas and that two or more public universities often compete to serve the same region.¹⁴ Task force members noted, however, that because of the size and diverse nature of those areas, some groups within St. Louis and Kansas City remain underserved.

¹⁰ NCHEMS Role and Mission for Missouri Colleges and Universities, slide 8.

¹¹ NCHEMS Draft Observations and Recommendations on Missouri Role and Missions, slide 7.

¹² NCHEMS Missouri Environmental Scan, slides 63-65.

¹³ NCHMES Role and Mission for Missouri Colleges and Universities, slide 6.

¹⁴ NCHEMS Draft Observations and Recommendations on Missouri Role and Missions, slide 7.

**Higher Education System Review
Task Force Roster**

Chuck Ambrose (University of Central Missouri)
Joanna Anderson (State Fair Community College)
Jon Bauer (East Central College)
Barbara Bichelmeyer (University of Missouri-Kansas City)
Doug Davenport (Missouri Western State University)
Steve Graham (University of Missouri)
Mark James (Metropolitan Community College)
Jeff Jochems (Ozarks Technical Community College)
Steve Kurtz (Mineral Area College)
Jennifer Methvin (Crowder College)
Zora Mulligan (Commissioner of Higher Education)
Jeff Pittman (St. Louis Community College)
Clif Smart (Missouri State University)
Dwyane Smith (Harris-Stowe State University)
Shawn Strong (State Technical College)
Carlos Vargas (Southeast Missouri State University)

Program Approval Framework

Background

On March 17, 2016, Speaker of the House Todd Richardson and House Higher Education Committee chair Steve Cookson directed the Missouri Department of Higher Education (MDHE) to convene stakeholders to begin a process of reviewing the current structure of higher education in Missouri. The letter indicated that the review should include, but not be limited to, recommendations on the overall structure of public two- and four-year institutions, varying institutional missions, and the degree review and approval process. The MDHE has convened a task force to address the issues identified in the letter. The task force formed a subcommittee of chief academic officers (CAOs) to address the degree review and approval process. Because this process to some extent also involves independent institutions, the subcommittee includes representation from that sector and will make recommendations relating to the process for all institutions of higher education.

The following draft is based, in part, on the structure and format of the review processes in Indiana, Texas, and Maryland, as well as current CBHE policies and practices. The draft has been refined substantially after discussion with the subcommittee and other CAOs. It provides a general framework for determining which level of review is appropriate and an overview of the requirements and process associated with each level. After the subcommittee, task force, and CBHE approve the policy framework, MDHE staff will work with the Council of Chief Academic Officers to define additional details, which will eventually be promulgated as regulations.

Objectives

This draft is aimed at outlining a process that achieves three objectives:

1. Ensure Missouri's higher education institutions offer rigorous, high-quality, student-centered programs that effectively serve the citizens of the state while supporting statewide goals, regional workforce demands, and institutional needs.
2. Ensure Missouri's higher education institutions make efficient use of state resources, maintain high standards, collaborate to the maximum extent possible, and design programs that avoid unnecessary duplication at the regional and state levels.
3. Streamline the academic program review and approval process.

General Approach

The MDHE proposes a review process that involves three levels of review: Staff review, which applies to minor changes; routine review, which will likely apply to most new program proposals; and comprehensive review. The following table provides a general framework for determining which level of review is appropriate and an overview of the requirements and process associated with each level. As indicated above, after the subcommittee, task force, and CBHE approve the policy framework, MDHE staff will work with the Council of Chief Academic Officers to define additional details, which will eventually be promulgated as regulations. Many terms and concepts will require further definition. Those that have been identified in early discussions are italicized in the following text and listed at the end of the document.

	Staff Review	Routine Review	Comprehensive Review
Applies To	<p>Minor program changes can be addressed through a simple staff review. Examples of these changes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Change of program title</i> • <i>Combination programs</i> • <i>Single-semester certificate programs</i> • <i>One-year certificate programs</i> • Adding an <i>option</i> to an existing program • Moving an existing program to <i>inactive status</i> • <i>Program deletion</i> 	<p>Proposals that do not constitute a significant change in an institution's current role, scope, or mission will be reviewed under the routine review process. In order to qualify for the routine review process, the proposed program must meet <u>all</u> of the following criteria:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program is clearly within the institution's <i>CBHE-approved mission</i>. For purposes of this process, "mission" means the population the institution serves; the level and array of degrees, programs, and services it offers; and any special or unique features; 2. The program will be offered within the proposing institution's <i>CBHE-approved service region</i>; 3. The program will not <i>unnecessarily duplicate</i> an existing program in the <i>applicable geographic area</i>; 4. The program will be offered at the main campus; 5. The program will build on existing programs and faculty expertise; and 6. The cost to launch the program will be minimal and within the institution's current operating budget. <p>In addition, the following proposals will generally be considered under the routine review process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Substantive curricular changes to an existing program</i>. 2. The addition of an approved program at a <i>CBHE-approved off-site location</i>. 3. New degree programs that are offered in collaboration with an institution already approved to offer such a program. 	<p>Proposals that constitute more significant changes will be subject to a comprehensive review. Program proposals offered by an institution other than a campus within the University of Missouri System that meet <u>any one</u> of the following will be subject to a comprehensive review:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The program is outside an institution's <i>CBHE-approved mission</i>. For purposes of this process, "mission" means the population the institution serves; the level and array of degrees, programs, and services it offers; and any special or unique features; 2. The program will be offered outside the institution's <i>CBHE-approved service region</i>; 3. The program will require approval from the Higher Learning Commission; 4. The institution will incur substantial costs to launch and sustain the program; 5. The program will include the offering of an engineering degree that falls within the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code of 14; 6. The program will include the offering of a doctoral degree; 7. The program will include the offering of a professional degree; or 8. The program will include the offering of an education specialist degree.
Institution Must Provide	A basic description of the change on forms provided by the MDHE.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>General information about the proposed program</i>; 2. <i>Certification</i> that the proposal meets the criteria for routine review outlined above; and 3. Certification that the program meets the <i>criteria for all new academic programs</i>. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence the proposing institution has explored the feasibility of collaboration with other institutions whose mission or service region are within the scope of the proposed program. The proposing institution shall provide evidence that it has made a good faith effort to explore the feasibility of collaboration. Evidence should include an explanation for why the collaboration is not feasible, as well as a letter of corroboration from any other institution involved in the discussion of collaboration. 2. <i>General information about the proposed program</i>; 3. <i>Evidence</i> that the offering institution is contributing substantially to the CBHE's <i>Blueprint for Higher Education</i> and committed to advancing the goals of that plan; 4. <i>Evidence of institutional capacity</i> to launch the program in a high-quality manner, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1. An <i>external review</i> conducted by a team including faculty experts in the discipline to be

	Staff Review	Routine Review	Comprehensive Review
			<p>offered and administrators from institutions already offering programs in the discipline and at the degree level proposed. The review must include an assessment of the offering institution's capacity to offer the new program in terms of general, academic, and student service support;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.2. A comprehensive cost/revenue analysis summarizing the actual costs for the program and information about how the institution intends to fund and sustain the program; 4.3. Evidence indicating there is sufficient student interest and capacity to support the program, and, where applicable, sufficient capacity for students to participate in clinical or other external learning requirements; and 4.4. Where applicable, a description of accreditation requirements for the new program and the institution's plans for seeking accreditation; and 5. Evidence that the proposed program is needed, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.1. Documentation demonstrating that the program does not <i>unnecessarily duplicate</i> other programs in the <i>applicable geographic area</i>; 5.2. Evidence indicating that the offering institution has made a good faith effort to explore the feasibility of a <i>collaborative program</i>, and if the institution has chosen not to offer the program in <i>collaboration</i> with another institution, an explanation of the rationale for that choice; and 5.3. A rigorous analysis demonstrating a strong and compelling workforce need for the program, which might include data from a credible source, an analysis of changing program requirements, the current and future workforce and other needs of the state, and/or letters of support from local or regional businesses indicating need for the program; 6. A clear plan to meet the articulated workforce need, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1. Aligning curriculum with specific knowledge and competencies needed to work in the field(s) or occupation(s) described in the workforce need section; 6.2. Providing students with external learning

	Staff Review	Routine Review	Comprehensive Review
			<p>experiences to increase the probability that they will remain in the <i>applicable geographic area</i> after graduation;</p> <p>6.3. A plan for assessing the extent to which the new program meets that need when implemented.</p>
Process	Proposals subject to the Staff Review process will be reviewed by MDHE staff and reported at the next CBHE meeting. Institutions must report all program changes to ensure that the state program inventory is accurate and complete.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MDHE staff review the proposal to determine if the proposed program is eligible for routine review. 2. MDHE staff post the proposal for public review and comment, along with staff's recommendation to approve the program provisionally. 3. [The final draft policy framework will describe the CBHE approval process in more detail. MDHE staff intend to discuss process changes with the CBHE that would reduce the total time required for approval of a new degree proposal under the routine review process.] 4. The five-year provisional review process currently in use applies. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. MDHE staff and other institutions review the proposal and provide feedback to the offering institution. 2. The offering institution responds to feedback. 3. [New program proposals subject to the comprehensive review process will be reviewed on the timeline currently in place. This will be detailed more thoroughly in the final draft.] 4. If approved, new programs approved under the comprehensive review process must report annually to the CBHE on the number of students completing the program, financial performance of the program, job placement rates of program graduates, success on any applicable licensure exams, and the extent to which the program is meeting the needs it was designed to address.

Terms to be defined:

Applicable geographic area

CBHE-approved mission

CBHE-approved off-site location

CBHE-approved service region

Certification

Change of program title

Collaborative program and collaboration

Combination programs

Comprehensive cost/revenue analysis

Criteria for all new academic programs

Evidence of contribution to CBHE Blueprint

Evidence of institutional capacity

External review

General information about the proposed program

Inactive status

One-year certificate programs

Option

Program deletion

Single-semester certificate programs

Substantive curricular changes to an existing program

Unnecessary duplication/unnecessarily duplicate

Professional Degree